UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,394	03/29/2006	Matti Kivikko	06267.0128	6385
22852 7590 06/19/2009 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP			EXAMINER	
			STONE, CHRISTOPHER R	
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1614	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/19/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/541,394	KIVIKKO ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	CHRISTOPHER R. STONE	1614			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 Jules</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This     Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 3-8 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw  5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 3-8 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or  Application Papers  9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ access that any objection to the company of the specificant may not request that any objection to the company is/are: a) ☐ access that any objection to the company is/are: a) ☐ access that any objection to the company is/are: a) ☐ access that any objection to the company is/are: a) ☐ access that any objection to the company is/are: a) ☐ access that any objection to the company is/are: a) ☐ access that any objection to the company is/are.	relection requirement. r. epted or b)□ objected to by the B				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex-		•			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 06/08/2009.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

## **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 8, 2009, has been entered.

Applicants' arguments, filed June 8, 2009, have been fully considered but are not considered persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

### Status of Claims

Claims 3-8 are currently pending and under examination.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

Page 3

Claims 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paralkar et al (US 2001/0041729 A1) in view of Pagel et al. (British Journal of Pharmacology, Vol. 119, p. 609-615, 1996, provided by Applicant).

Claims 3-8 are drawn to a method of treating renal failure in a mammal and reducing the mortality in a mammal suffering from renal failure, wherein the mortality is associated with the deterioration of kidney function, comprising administering daily or periodically, levosimendan or its metabolite (R)-N-[4-(1,4,5,6- tetrahydro-4-methyl-6-oxo-3-pyridazinyl)phenyl]acetamide, or any of their pharmaceutically acceptable salts thereof.

Paralkar et al (US 2001/0041729 A1) teaches a method of treating renal failure in a mammal, including end stage renal failure comprising orally administering a renal vasodilator periodically, i.e. via per day dosages (paragraphs 0007, 0018, 0041,0057 and 0067). Said method is taught to delay or halt the progression of renal failure, which ultimately results in death without therapeutic intervention, i.e. the method is taught to reduce mortality in a mammal suffering from renal failure, wherein the mortality is associated with the deterioration of kidney function (paragraph 0007). Paralkar et al

Art Unit: 1614

does not teach levosimendan as the specific renal vasodilator. Pagel et al teaches that levosimendan increases renal medullary blood flow and reduces vascular resistance in both the medullary and cortical bends and that the compound is a renal vasodilator (p. 613, left column, 1<sup>st</sup> full paragraph). Therefore it would have been obvious to treat renal failure in a mammal and reduce the mortality in a mammal suffering from renal failure, wherein the mortality is associated with the deterioration of kidney function by administering levosimendan, since the compound was known to have renal vasodilatory activity that was know to be useful in the treatment of renal failure, thus resulting in the practice of the instantly claimed invention with a reasonable expectation of success.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 3-8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection above.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER R. STONE whose telephone number is (571)270-3494. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:30am-4:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin H. Marschel can be reached on (571) 272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/541,394 Page 5

Art Unit: 1614

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

16June2009 CRS

/Patricia A. Duffy/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1645